

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,872	12/29/2005	Tim Froidcoeur	NL 030821	6756
	7590 08/14/200 ILLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			HUSSAIN, FARRUKH	
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,872	FROIDCOEUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FARRUKH HUSSAIN	2444	

	FARRUKH HUSSAIN	2444				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is cheeded, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhaunder 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any pely received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete.	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> </ol>			cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		to the second second term of				
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>			ne issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	a on the health of the other of		DTOL 004)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [	Till not be entered or b\ ⊠il	l he entered and an e	unionation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .		r be entered and an e.	xpianation of			
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18 and 20-27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	DTO/SB/08) Paper No/e)					
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	1 10/05/00) Faper No(s).					
/Farrukh Hussain/	/Philip C Lee/					

Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448

Continuation of 13. Other: Point A. Applicants argue that the Claim 9 was amended in the applicants' prior response to specifically state that the control software is stored on a computer-readable medium.

As to Point A, the examiner states that the specification does not define computer-readable medium. Therfore, the Specification Objection and the 35 U.S.C. 101 Claim Rejection will be maintained. The examiner would also like to remind applicants that the claim 19 is missing as stated in the last Oflice Action.

Point B. Applicants argue that the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest a renderer-control point combination that receives a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, as specifically claimed in independent claim 1

As to Point B, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Weast does teach or suggest use the organizational context of a content item as represented in a URP Content Directory Service (see column 3, lines 35-53, elements 102, Device (Control Point) and 106 Media Renderer are coupled to each other and see figure 4a, Address: "ZiMyMediaMusic) and Salmonsen does teach or suggest enabling a Media/Renderer-Control Point combination to receive a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description (see paragraph 0123, lines 1-15 The media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIS) that identify content resources are see paragraph 0008, lines 1-11 a communication media device (Control point) comprises an internal media content source, an internal interface coupled to the internal media content source and capable of carrying media content in a media refractor, and media refractor carrying media content source, an internal interface coupled to the internal media content source and capable of carrying media content sucreas and expelled resources.

Point C. The applicants argue that the Office action fails to identify where Salmonsen teaches a URI that is representative of the directory, as claimed by the applicants.

As to Point C, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Salmonsen teaches a URI that is representative of the directory (see paragraph 0123, lines 1-15 The media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that identify content resources).

Point D. The applicants argue that the combination of Weast and Salmonsen does not teach or suggest processing a URI representation of the content directory description to enable a renderer to exploit the organization context of a content item, as content item, as Manager to exploit the organization context of a content item. Salmonsen does teach or suggest processing a URI representation of the content directory description to enable a renderer to exploit the organization context of a content item Salmonsen does teach or suggest processing a URI representation of the content directory description to enable a renderer to exploit the organization context of a content item (salmonsen) context of a content item (salmonsen), lines 1-9 The processor 314 executes various processes, methods, or programs that control operations of the emulator interface controller 310 to transfer information between a network external to the device 300 and the content source 302 or communication bus 338 and to perform a wide variety of other functions).

Point E. The applicants argue that the combination of Weast and Salmonsen does not teach or suggest receiving a URI corresponding to a context of a content item from an external controller, and does not teach or suggest determining a subsequent content item for rendering based on this received context, as specifically claimed in claim 22.

As to Point E, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Weast and Salmonsen does teach or suggest deceiving a URI corresponding to a context of a content item from an external controller, and does not teach or suggest determing a subsequent content item for rendering based on this received context. Salmonsen does teach or suggest receiving a URI corresponding to a context of a content item for mon an external controller (see paragraph 00.07, lines 1-7 The sumulator can then convert content received from an external source in an unsupported format to the supported format). Weast teaches or suggests determining a subsequent content item for rendering based on this received context, (see column 1), lines 3-4-46, determining the medial type of the medial content item for rendering the operation includes facilitating a user in selection one of a number of UPnP media renderers 106 equipped to support the media type, if more than one UPnP media renderer 106 is so equipped.